THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION Nos.20618 & 21185 of 2000
and 1304 & 1307 of 2001

Dated: 24-07-2007

Between:

Sarathi Anant Raghavendra Rao and others.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

The Government of Andhra Pradesh, rep.by its Secretary,
Hyderabad, and others.

.....RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION Nos.20618 & 21185 of 2000
and 1304 & 1307 of 2001

COMMON ORDER:

These writ petitions are filed assailing the proceedings/order dated 28.09.1993 issued by fifth respondent, namely, the Special Officer and Competent Authority, Urban Land Ceiling, Hyderabad, purportedly under Section 8(4) of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act, 1976 (the Act, for brevity), whereby fifth respondent declared Smt.Jahangir Begum, Mohd. Safdar Hussain and Mohd. Siddiqi Hussain to be the surplus landholders, and the consequential proceedings dated 31.05.2000. The petitioners in W.P.Nos.20618, 21185 of 2000 and 1304 of 2001, who are employees of Hindustan Aeronautics Limited and the petitioner in W.P.No.1307 of 2001, who is an agriculturist, are members of M/s Venkateshwara Cooperative Housing Society Limited, which purchased land from the declarants and allotted the same as house sites to its members including the petitioners in W.P.Nos.20618, 21185 of 2000 and 1307 of 2001 and the vendor of the petitioner in W.P.No.1304 of 2001. The petitioners assail the final orders passed under Section 8(4) of the Act, *inter alia*, on the ground that the provisions of the Act have no application to the land, which was declared by Smt.Jahangir Begum and two others, and also by reason of G.O.Ms.No.733 dated 31.10.1988.

When these matters were taken up for hearing, the learned Special Government Pleader for Urban Land Ceiling (ULC) has placed before this Court the order dated 02.06.2001 passed by the Commissioner of Appeals in ULC Appeal Nos.Hyd.114 & 115 of 2000 dated 02.06.2001, whereby and whereunder the orders impugned in these writ petitions and all subsequent proceedings were set aside and the matters were remanded to fifth respondent. In view of this, it is not necessary for this Court to deal with various contentions raised in these writ petitions. If so advised, the petitioners may get impleaded before fifth respondent for necessary redressal. The cause of action in these writ petitions does not survive and the writ petitions have become infructuous.

The writ petitions, with the above observations, are accordingly dismissed as infructuous. No costs.

_____

(**V.V.S.RAO, J**)

24th July, 2007
ghn